UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/601,995	06/23/2003	Richard D. Dettinger	ROC920030158US1	9828	
	7590	EXAMINER			
DEPT 917, BLDG. 006-1 3605 HIGHWAY 52 NORTH			JUNG, ALLEN J		
	MN 55901-7829	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
·			3628		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			09/04/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/601,995	DETTINGER ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		

		7.22211 0. 00110	0020	
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address	
THE	REPLY FILED <u>17 August 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. 🛚	The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appelor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidav eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	it, or other evidence, which pl with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a F	aces the Request
a)	The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	g date of the final rejection.		
b)	no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailir (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN TH	ng date of the final rejection.	
have l under set for may r	MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07( sions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the sth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office latereduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) CE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1. tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origon than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropriate exter inally set in the final Office action	nsion fee ; or (2) as
	The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two months of the	date of
	filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed was NDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the appea	
3. 🗌	The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, I  (a) They raise new issues that would require further con  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	nsideration and/or search (see NO		
	(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a	ter form for appeal by materially re		es for
	NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally rej	ected ciaims.	
4. 🔲		21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	ompliant Amendment (PTOL-3	324).
5. 🛚			, ,	•
6. 🗖	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s).	lowable if submitted in a separate,		
7. 🛚	For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed:  Claim(s) objected to:  Claim(s) rejected: 1-37,46-53 and 55-74.  Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		ill be entered and an explanat	ion of
<u>AFFI</u>	DAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
8. 🗌	The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
9. 🗌	The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fails to pro	
	The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation JEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attached.	
	The request for reconsideration has been considered bu	t does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowance beca	ause:
	Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). Other: See Continuation Sheet.	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	HN W HAYES/ ervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3628			

Continuation of 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 35 U.S.C. 101 Rejection for 1, 3, 6-11, 46-53, and 55-58, and 35 U.S.C. 112 Rejection for claims 1 and 8.

Continuation of 13. Other: With regard to the 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection on claim 70, the rejection is maintained because displaying an interface on an output device is considered an insignificant extra solution activity, in terms of positively reciting a machine that executes process steps.

With regard to the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection, the Applicant had presented arguments against the teachings of Rao (US 2003/0110087 A1). The Examiner respectfully disagrees, and maintains the rejections. As discussed in the telephone interview on 08/26/2009, the Examiner respectfully submits that the terms "field" or "logical field" are not limited to a certain interpretation such as data "columns" of a database record. The Examiner respectfully submits that when interpreting the limitation "each fee schedule for a given logical field defines a fee to be charged...," one of ordinary skill in the art could certainly have an interpretation that the "logical field" is a label for a unit of data, regardless of the orientation (row or columns) of the data. Rao clearly teaches that "pricing structures can include different prices for access to different types of data," so for accessing a given unit of data, such access would cost a certain amount of price associated with its type. The Examiner additionally notes that the Applicant's original specification does not have a specific definition for "logical field" that would give a special meaning to the terminology. See also MPEP § 2111.01.